Case 2:05-cv-00841-MEF-SRW

Document 20

Filed 12/05/2005

Page 1 of 2


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

OZZIE JACKSON,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:05-cv-841-F
PFIZER, INC., et. al.,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. # 14) filed on September 26, 2005. The Court has considered the arguments in support of and in opposition to this motion. It is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- 1. Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. # 14) is GRANTED and this case is STAYED pending a final decision from the Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on transfer of this case to the multi-district litigation proceeding.
- A ruling on Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand (Doc. # 8) filed on September 7,
 2005, is WITHHELD pending a final decision from the Panel on Multidistrict
 Litigation on transfer of this case to the multi-district litigation proceeding.
 DONE, this 5th day of December, 2005.



> /s/ Susan Russ Walker SUSAN RUSS WALKER UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Case 2:05-cv-00832-MEF-SRW

Document 22

Filed 10/20/2005

Page 1 of 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

)	
)	
)	Case No.: 2:05-cv-832-F
)	
)	
)	
)	
))))))))

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings

Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. # 16) filed on September 26,

2005. The Court has considered the arguments in support of and in opposition to this motion.

It is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- 1. Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. # 16) is GRANTED and this case is STAYED pending a final decision from the Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on transfer of this case to the multi-district litigation proceeding.
- A ruling on Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand (Doc. # 8) filed on September 7,
 2005 is WITHHELD pending a final decision from the Panel on Multidistrict
 Litigation on transfer of this case to the multi-district litigation proceeding.
 DONE this 20th day of October, 2005.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Case 2:05-cv-00824-MEF-SRW

Document 23

Filed 11/15/2005

Page 1 of 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

KATIE THOMAS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:05-cv-824-F
)	
PFIZER, INC., et. al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings

Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. # 14) filed on September 26,

2005. The Court has considered the arguments in support of and in opposition to this motion.

It is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- 1. Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. # 14) is GRANTED and this case is STAYED pending a final decision from the Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on transfer of this case to the multi-district litigation proceeding.
- 2. A ruling on Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand (Doc. # 7) filed on September 7, 2005 is WITHHELD pending a final decision from the Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on transfer of this case to the multi-district litigation proceeding.

DONE this 15th day of November, 2005.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Case 2:05-cv-00941-MEF-VPM

Filed 11/21/2005

Page 1 of 2

Document 14

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HALL, SR.,)	
As the Administrator of the Estate of)	
WILLIAM RANDOLPH HALL, JR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:05-cv-941-F
)	
PFIZER, INC., et. al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. #9) filed on 21 October 2005. The Court has considered the arguments in support of and in opposition to this motion. It is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings Pending Transfer to 1. Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. # 9) is GRANTED. This cause is STAYED pending MDL transfer to In re Bextra and Celebrex Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation, MDL-1699.
- A ruling on Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand (Doc. #7) filed on 7 October 2005 2. is WITHHELD pending a final decision from the Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on transfer of this case to the multi-district litigation proceeding.
- Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Reply (Doc. # 12) is DENIED as 3.

Case 2:05-cv-00941-MEF-VPM Document 14 Filed 11/21/2005

Page 2 of 2

MOOT.

DONE this 21ST day of November, 2005.

/s/ Vanzetta Penn McPherson VANZETTA PENN MCPHERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Case 2:06-cv-00254-ID-SRW Document 5-4 Filed 03/23/2006 Page 7 of 8

Case 2:05-cv-00542-M Document 17 Filed 11/17/2005 Page 1 of 2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANN BEVERLY, etc., :

:

Plaintiff,

:

vs. : CIVIL ACTION 05-0542-M

:

PFIZER INC., et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

The Court heard from counsel this date by telephone on the Notice of Parties' Planning Meeting (Doc. 15) and the status of this action. It appears that this action will be transferred as a tag-along action to the Northern District of California within the next several days, to become a part of MDL-1699, In re Bextra and Cellebrex Marketing, Sales, Practices and Products Liability Litigation. Therefore, Defendants' Motion for a Stay of All Proceedings Pending Transfer to Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding (Doc. 7) is GRANTED.

Plaintiff's Motion for Expedited, Emergency Ruling (Doc. 10) is MOOT. Plaintiff's Emergency Motion to Remand and Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 9), with supporting brief (Doc. 11), and Defendants' Reply Brief (Doc. 13) will be considered if and when this action is remanded to this District.

The fictitious parties set out in the complaint are

Case 2:06-cv-00254-ID-SRW Document 5-4 Filed 03/23/2006 Page 8 of 8

Case 2:05-cv-00542-M Document 17 Filed 11/17/2005 Page 2 of 2

hereby STRICKEN since fictitious party pleading is not generally recognized under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See e.g., Fed.R.Civ.P. 10(a); 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); Rommell v. Automobile Racing Club of America, Inc., 964 F.2d 1090, 1098 n.14 (11th Cir. 1992); Weeks v. Benton, 649 F.Supp. 1297, 1298 (S.D. Ala. 1986).

Counsel for the parties are to ensure that all future filings contain the correct and proper names of the corporate Defendants as more fully set out in Defendants' Answer (Doc. 2).

DONE this 17th day of November, 2005.

s/BERT W. MILLING, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE